



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1108/20442081111180377](https://doi.org/10.1108/20442081111180377)

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Wilson, N. (2011). The business of authenticity: a false relation?. *Arts Marketing: An International Journal*, 1(2), 159-170. [10.1108/20442081111180377](https://doi.org/10.1108/20442081111180377)

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

School of Arts & Humanities

www.kcl.ac.uk/cmci

Department of Culture, Media
& Creative Industries



University of London

Dr Nick Wilson (CMCI, King's College London, Room 10D, Chesham Building,
Strand Campus, London WC2R 2LS)

This pre-print paper is copyright of the author, but it is free to be used for research purposes as long as it is properly attributed. Permissions for multiple reproductions should be addressed to the author. This paper is intended to circulate work that readers might not otherwise be able to access as their institution does not subscribe to the journal, or the article is in press. If your institution does subscribe to the journal, please access it via that link.

Please cite as Wilson, N. (2011) The business of authenticity: a false relation?, Arts Marketing An International Journal, 1(2):159-170.
DOI: 10.1108/20442081111180377

IMPORTANT: When referring to this paper, please check the page numbers in the journal published version and cite these.

The business of authenticity: a false relation?

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this research paper is to consider the aesthetic and commercial success of the “early music” or “historically informed performance” (HIP) movement during the 1970s and 1980s in the UK. Particular attention is given to the relationship between HIP performers and “the authenticity business” (i.e. the market-driven commercial exploitation of this form of musical performance).

Design/methodology/approach – Through applying the metaphor of the “false relation” (a musical compositional device characteristic of the renaissance period), the paper explores the contradictory relationship between HIP and the market. The research is based on a detailed literature review relating to the emergence of the early music labour market, and interviews with 40 experts in the field (including HIP music directors, performers, agents, broadcasters, record company directors and instrument makers in the UK).

Findings – Far from being a mere backdrop to the ideologically driven practice of HIP, the paper demonstrates the close connection between market-led entrepreneurial activity of some performers, and the subsequent success of early music performance. Particular attention is brought to the mediating role of authenticity discourse in bridging the art-commerce divide and marketing early music successfully.

Originality/value – The paper offers a novel perspective from which to understand the artistic and commercial development of this cultural movement. It is suggested that the emphasis on the mediating role of authenticity discourse; and the closeness of the relationship between performance ideology and market-based practices warrants further research across artistic and cultural movements more broadly.

Keywords Early music, Authenticity, Entrepreneurs, Performance, Emergence, Marketing

1. Introduction

The early music movement (alternatively known as the authenticity movement, period instrument movement, or historically informed performance (HIP) movement)^[1] gained particular prominence in the late 1960s and early 1970s in the UK. Over a few years, the performers involved moved from being regarded as a bunch of quirky amateurs engaged in a rather quaint (and, to many, misguided) cultural experiment, to gaining incontestable artistic legitimacy. Such is the success of the early music movement that it is now difficult to find performances of classical music repertoire pre-1800 played by modern orchestras and ensembles. Period instrument groups (i.e. those performing on original instruments in an historically informed style) now monopolise much of the repertoire. A distinct set of specialist professional performers comprises an important part of the wider classical music labour market. Departments in music colleges and universities are dedicated to early music performance. Recordings and live performances of the canonical works of such composers as Bach, Handel, and Mozart (as well as later works by Beethoven, Berlioz, etc.) have become, in effect, the sole realm of HIP performers.

In studying the early music movement one is confronted by many apparent contradictions. To begin with, there are contrasting accounts of the individuals involved in HIP, their interests, behaviours and motivations. For example, the “historical fetishism” (Adorno, 1967) of HIP performers conjures up a dogmatic approach that takes the soul out of music making. The “scholar-performer” is parodied as someone more interested in preserving the past according to “rules” laid down in a dusty old treatise, than in bringing a long-forgotten piece of music back to life:

All this music-making by the book is a bit pitiful [...] for all I know their players may take a pinch of snuff during the pauses before the last chords [...] but they also sound flat and have no guts (Paul Henry Lang, in Kenyon, 1988, p. 5).

Alongside this perspective, we can point to an apparent distancing from the avowed ideals of the early music movement. Bruce Haynes’ book *The End of Early Music* (2007), for example, refers not to “historically informed performance” (see Butt, 2002) but to “historically inspired performance”. The change seems symptomatic of a hedging of bets, the retreat away from truth claims about how performers should perform “older” music.

Meanwhile, an increasingly romanticised view of the movement has also arisen in some quarters, which hails the free spirited, unbridled enthusiasm of the early music pioneers. John Potter (himself a singer much involved in early music performance during the 1970s and 1980s), refers to the “charismatic musical pirates who started the movement” (Potter, n.d.)^[2]. There seems to be an increasing awareness that early music pioneers, far from slavishly following the dogma of performance practice, were in fact breaking new ground. As Potter observes:

Munrow, like his near contemporaries Roger Norrington, John Eliot Gardiner, Trevor Pinnock, Christopher Hogwood, Emma Kirkby, the Hilliard Ensemble, Gothic Voices – everyone before early music entered the mainstream in fact – managed to do what they did without the benefit of institutional instruction. The fact is, we all made it up (Potter, n.d.).

Underlying these different portrayals of early music performers is the question of whether those involved were really doing something “new” – a form of “modernism in disguise” (Butt, 2002). For Adorno, the early music movement was “part of a wider cultural malaise in the wake of the depersonalising forces of industrialism and late capitalism” (in Butt, 2002, p. 5). Hennion and Fauquet (2001, p. 87) put the position quite simply: “Nothing is more modern than an historical approach to an old repertoire”. Of all the issues raised in writing about the early music movement, this is probably the one that has received most attention (see Adorno, 1967; Morgan, 1988; Kenyon, 1988; Taruskin, 1982, 1988; Taruskin et al., 1984; Hennion and Fauquet, 2001; Butt, 2002; Haynes, 2007).

Another apparent contradiction concerns the relationship between authentic performance – which by definition is “live” – and its reliance on the recording industry for its success. Antoine Hennion drew attention to this “paradox of Baroque

revival” in his paper on music, mediators and musical taste, in 1997:

[...] the general recourse to once forgotten instruments owes much to the silence of its principal actual mediator: the disc. Only the extensive use of modern recording techniques has allowed Baroque music to speak out again (p. 420). The capturing of music on record is responsible for its freedom (p. 426).

My aim in this paper is to better understand some of the market-related issues which lie behind such contradictions. I seek to re-focus attention on what I consider to be the “principal actual mediator” of HIP, which is the professional performer of early music, not the disc. For as Kenyon (1988, p. 15) observes, “music operates through performances, and we cannot abstract ourselves from that process”. Interestingly, this relationship between the musical score and performance (or “Text and Act”) was central to Taruskin’s (1995) “brilliantly articulated” (Haynes, 2007, p. 10) critique of the authenticity movement^[3]. Nevertheless, the discourse surrounding authenticity appears to have overlooked the broader (and no less important) market context of those involved. What might otherwise appear as the mundane circumstances motivating, enabling and constraining the professional performer are generally left out of arguments for, and against authentic performance. Rather, it is simply tacitly assumed that early music performers shared the same motivation to perform in a HIP style. This has led to what I consider to be a partial and somewhat lifeless account of the early music movement, characterised by an on-going disconnect between the espoused ideological intentions of HIP and the actions of those supposed to be pursuing them.

This observation is perhaps all the more surprising when you consider the fact that authenticity commentators have themselves given so much (negative) press to the role of the market. Taruskin (1988, p. 137) for example, writes:

Do we really want to talk about “authenticity” any more? I had hoped a consensus was forming that to use the word in connection with the performance of music – and especially to define a particular style, manner, or philosophy of performance – is neither description nor critique, but commercial propaganda, the stock-in-trade of press agents and promoters.

It is almost as if authenticity is being dismissed here on the basis of its alleged association with market (hence instrumental) interests. This completely overlooks the necessity of all performers (i.e. including HIP players) to act within the constraining (and enabling) socio-economic context of capitalism. Though the intrinsic motivation of “artists” is routinely contrasted with the extrinsic motivation of everyone else (see Frey and Pommerehne, 1989), market forces cannot simply be ignored. Being paid for performing in a historically informed manner (or any other for that matter) is relevant to the motivations and behaviours of the performers concerned.

My approach in this paper is very much in keeping with the institutional perspective outlined by Santoro (2002) in his study of the Italian “cantautore”. However, we cannot explain the development of the HIP “movement” (a dynamic concept, after all) without also accounting for how relevant social institutions and agents involved are

themselves reproduced and/or transformed in the process. In other words, what is needed is a causal explanation of the emergence of the movement and its institutions over time. Though such a full explanatory account goes beyond the scope of this paper, it is clear that the HIP pioneers were themselves transformed in the emergence of the early music movement. I hope to capture at least some of their unfolding story here.

My starting point and inspiration is the false relation – a compositional device used widely in much of the polyphonic vocal music that is considered core “early music” repertoire. The false relation involves breaking the rules of harmonic writing. Two voices that give rise to a chromatic contradiction are put together, often to great musical affect (as in Figure 1). By analogy, I argue that the early music movement can be understood in terms of the contradictory relationship between the ideologically informed practices of HIP performers on the one hand (i.e. ideas about how they should perform music with an interrupted interpretive tradition), and the market-centred interests of the commercially oriented authenticity business, on the other.

Figure 1.



A false relation from Byrd's Ave Verum Corpus

An exploration of the potentially contradictory nature of this relationship forms the central focus of the paper.

2. Movement and market: re-embedding early music performance

The relationship between the motivations and behaviours of HIP performers and the authenticity business needs careful scrutiny. In the rest of the paper, I discuss the evidence for three false assumptions or “myths”, which I see as characteristic of the general discourse about the (un-embedded) early music movement:

- (1) HIP performers are predominantly motivated by a quest for “authenticity” – i.e. the intention to re-create music as the composer would have heard it.
- (2) Record companies, with the support of some HIP performers, used uncritically or “fabricated” the label of authenticity for the purposes of commercial gain.
- (3) HIP performers were exploited by the authenticity business.

Each of these assumptions appears to be predicated on a foundational position that there are HIP performers who perform (authentically or otherwise), and then a cast of “others” – record producers, marketeers, agents and so on, who commercially exploit HIP through their instrumental use of authenticity. In other words, there are two types of people working with different, and not always complementary goals in mind. Analysis of these “myths” provides a very good way of looking in more detail at the (false) relation between HIP performers and the authenticity business.

I seek to bring attention to the more complex relationship between HIP performers and the authenticity business (i.e. the commercial exploitation of authentic approaches to performance of early music)^[4]. The paper considers to what extent, like the false relation, this contradictory relationship is crucial to the subsequent success of the movement. This, in turn, uncovers the mediating role of authenticity discourse. Rather than seeing this discourse as operating in opposition to the market-driven motivations of the commercial record companies, etc. I discuss the extent to which it acts to bridge the art-commerce divide and market early music successfully.

My research methodology involved analysis of data collected from my doctoral thesis and beyond (2003 onwards). This included face-to-face interviews with 40 HIP performers, music directors, record producers, agents and other experts. I have drawn on this research to review and challenge the above assumptions. For the reader unfamiliar with the HIP movement there will be reference to some of its leading figures, such as Arnold Dolmetsch, David Munrow, Christopher Hogwood, Trevor Pinnock, Roger Norrington, John Eliot Gardiner, etc. These and other individuals are indeed central to the story. However, so too is a coterie of professional HIP performers, record producers, performer-scholars and instrument makers whose names do not appear either on the record sleeves of key recordings or in the early music history books. I have anonymised quotations where it is not necessary to know who is speaking.

3. Motivation of HIP performers

(1) HIP performers are predominantly motivated by a quest for “authenticity” – i.e. the intention to re-create music as the composer would have heard it.

The idea that HIP performers shared a common motivation for authenticity, understood as a primary interest in the perceived performance intentions of the composer, is a relatively new one. According to Mayer-Brown (1988) it was only really with Arnold Dolmetsch, working in the first part of the twentieth century, that this quest for authenticity began to take root.

It was Arnold Dolmetsch more than anyone else who was committed to the idea that performers should try to play music in the way its composers intended. He, more than anyone else, is the founding father of the “cult of authenticity” (Mayer-Brown, 1988, p. 39).

It would not be for a further 30 years after Dolmetsch’s death (1940), that the early music “band wagon” (Kenyon, 1988), or “juggernaut, a steamroller, a conquering army” (Crutchfield, 1988, p. 19) really began to roll. It is interesting to note, in passing, that Dolmetsch was described by a Daily Telegraph critic as “perhaps the only musician at this time [1925] who was truly ‘self-dependent and self-sufficient’” (Campbell, 1975, p. 217). There is a suggestion that Dolmetsch, who “seemed more adept at refusing money for his work than accepting it [...]” (Campbell, 1975, p. 239), opted out of the market system, to some extent. Dolmetsch’s work was met with “the patronising indifference of the majority of the music profession” (Donnington, 1975, p. x). He was surrounded by largely amateur musicians and musical instrument makers at his Haslemere workshop. What they were doing was just too specialised for

its time, too cut off from the professional music mainstream (Campbell, 1975).

Bringing things more up-to-date, it is important to emphasise that the decision to engage with HIP performance for those players and singers involved in the 1960s and 1970s was neither as clear-cut nor as explicitly focused on authentic performance as one might think.

Interviewer: *Was it a conscious decision to go down this route?*

HIP Performer: *Subconscious, I should say. There was definitely a tide flowing [...] gaining momentum in the late 1960s, just at the time I was choosing [...] well not choosing my pathway.*

HIP Performer: *I think it was the fact that it was new [...] and that was the kind of music I particularly knew about and liked [...] but I had a kind of instinct that I wanted to explore.*

The focus on the “new” is important here. It is not incidental that many of the core players in the early years of the HIP movement came from performing contemporary music. The celebrated English counter-tenor Alfred Deller came to prominence after performances at Morley College in South London, under the artistic directorship of the composer Michael Tippett. Catherine Mackintosh, the leader of The Academy of Ancient Music and Orchestra of the Age of Enlightenment for many years, studied music at school under the contemporary composer Harrison Birtwistle, and recalls first being introduced to early music by him. A core group of such performers were motivated by doing something new, wanting autonomy and independence, and enjoying the play-space that their “counter-cultural” credentials afforded them. As one performer recalls “like contemporary musicians – it tended to attract people that were slightly more bizarre”.

More than any other motivator, it would seem that performers were primarily drawn to HIP because their artistic and aesthetic sensitivities were engaged by its novel and sometimes esoteric sounds and possibilities. As Trevor Pinnock, the director of The English Concert recalls “[...] I came to it very much through the gut – through my contact with music”. Another HIP performer states “I had that sort of passion [...] I just did have that passion – and I still do”. It was through the power of the music itself, therefore, (see DeNora, 2000) that perhaps HIP was to have its most compelling and motivating influence.

Whilst authenticity in performance is the banner that flies proudly above the early music movement, more detailed scrutiny draws attention to the variety of motivations that underpin why individuals actually engaged with HIP performance. This theme is now taken up further.

4. Record companies and fabricating authenticity

(2) Record companies, with the support of some HIP performers, used uncritically or “fabricated” the label of authenticity for the purposes of commercial gain.

There are fascinating parallels with Peterson’s study of the country music business in the USA between 1923 and 1953, in which he develops the idea of “fabricating authenticity” – “a socially agreed upon construct in which the past is to a degree

misremembered” (Peterson, 1997, p. 3). Peterson shows how the authentic nature of the country business in the USA was “continuously negotiated in an ongoing interplay between performers, diverse commercial interests, fans, and the evolving image” (Peterson, 1997, p. 4). Whereas Peterson’s discussion of negotiated authenticity remains “behind the scenes” as it were, being used as a *post hoc* explanation of the developing images of the “older timer”, the “hillbilly” or the “cowboy” in the “creation” of country music, authenticity is the explicit agenda and public discourse of the HIP movement. As such, the manner of this negotiation might be expected to be somewhat different.

As already stated, the modern-day case for “authentic” performance was first raised by a performer and instrument maker (Dolmetsch), not by the record industry. Indeed, it would be fair to characterise the major record companies’ approach to early music as decidedly wary, at first. Trevor Pinnock recalls the cautious manner in which Dr Holschneider, President of DG records eventually decided to contract The English Concert in 1978:

Pinnock: *[...] record companies always want something new and young. And, mm, I don’t think there were many serious groups [...] so it was natural. And he’d been researching the field for a long time. He’d seen me in 1973 and thought this was the way to go [...] and then he’d just waited.*

Interviewer: *Why did he wait?*

Pinnock: *I think for things to get better – to settle down. He was a cautious man, he had other people under contract. He wanted to find the right moment.*

This quotation reminds us that the real market decisions were taken by individuals, not institutions. In the 1970s and 1980s record company executives had more freedom than they do now to make these decisions. As one record producer during the 1970s remarked “[...] I don’t think I ever looked at the figures. No one told me I’d got to sell lots of records! It quickly changed”. What seems to have been more important than authenticity in the first instance was the belief in individual performers (e.g. record companies signed with HIP performers not with the ideology of authentic performance), as well as the music’s aesthetic and affective qualities, its sound, which moved record producers as much as performers:

I heard Concentus Musicus[5] in about 1965. Looking back the standard was probably not very high – but you were so convinced. There was enough about it to really transport you and [...] this is an emotional response – nothing to do with arguing the case, nothing to do with the theory [...] it was a completely emotional response – the thing appeared to be revealed (HIP Record Producer).

Of course, it would be misleading to suggest that record company executives simply chose to record whatever they wanted, with whomever they liked. From a commercial perspective, young and new performers offered the novelty and the affordability that the market needed. Furthermore authenticity could be used as a label to distinguish HIP from the established competition:

[...] it quickly became clear to the record companies that the legend “Performed on Authentic Instruments” was regarded as some sort of

seal of Good Musical Housekeeping, and the implication of much of their activity was that the use of such instruments guaranteed or at least went some considerable way to ensuring an “authentic” performance (Kenyon, 1988, p. 6).

“Authenticity” was applied as a shorthand for establishing the credentials of this other way of performing early music repertoire. In a very real sense, it offered a choice between more of the same and something “new”. As Haynes observes “there was a time when ‘AUTHENTIC’ sold records like ‘ORGANIC’ sells tomatoes”. Furthermore, “[...] if they were described as ‘authentic’ when they were really ‘an attempt to be authentic’, it seemed like quibbling” (Haynes, 2007, p. 10).

What is interesting about these perspectives on the fabrication of authenticity within the HIP movement, is the sense in which it masks the fundamental reality of the situation, which was that the early music movement was extraordinarily reliant on the record companies for its negotiated success. Interviews with some of the pioneer HIP performers brings this home strongly:

Interviewer: *In terms of success of the groups, how important was it to get a record contract?*

HIP Performer: *Essential really. It was a forcing house. The “boom” essentially gave British groups a head-start over everybody else, even though some of them, the Dutch/Belgian school, and to a certain extent Harnoncourt, had been going already. They were sort of overtaken in this flood of activity generated by this strange phenomenon which is the recording industry; and being based in London – Europe-wise, London tends to have more going on than anywhere else, I’m sure. We just went on doing what we were doing. Believing in what we were doing. I think that was the key. We believed that it was worth doing; and supported by the recording companies, which was, really, I guess they were the people who made it happen [...] by supporting us financially.*

What seems apparent is that the HIP performers did not feel that they needed to compromise their position on authentic performance. I discuss further the particular nature of the interaction between HIP performers and representatives of the authenticity business in the next section.

5. Selling [out to] early music?

(3) HIP performers were exploited by the authenticity business. Arnold Dolmetsch, the “founding father” of authenticity, was regarded as something of a maverick figure. No doubt his dressing up in smocks and sandals to perform early works for viols did little to deter this opinion of him and his “disciples”. His legacy lived on well into the early music movement’s revival. There was an enduring view within the mainstream classical music field that HIP performers were misguided and naive, drawn to “alternative” paths, a bit like New Age vegetarians:

Interviewer: *The brown rice and sandals thing is a tag that even now is difficult to get rid of. What do you put that down to?*

HIP Performer: *mm [...] a sort of un-commercial take on the musical profession. It was un-commercial when we first started. We didn’t know that it was going to be*

successful.

The implication of this view is that those involved were probably unable (or uninterested) in negotiating with commercial business interests. The evidence clearly shows this to be an over-simplification. In fact, the rise of the early music movement can be shown to be heavily dependent upon a particular breed of HIP performer who was able to “sell” authentic performances, to the BBC, to record companies, to promoters and venues, and to the wider listening public.

Interviewer: *Why did it happen in your generation?*

HIP Performer: *Well, I think thanks to people like David Munrow really [...] Chris Hogwood [...]*

Interviewer: *They were very good businessmen?*

HIP Performer: *Yeah.*

Interviewer: *In the sense of being very good salesmen?*

HIP Performer: *Entrepreneurs [...] and they believed in it. To be successful you have to have the dedication to your job plus a little bit of egoism that will take you into the public sphere.*

David Munrow presented the Pied Piper programme on BBC Radio 3 between August 1971 and 1976, introducing a sizeable audience to early music and its instruments. His music for *The Six Wives of Henry VIII* (1970) and *Elizabeth R* (1971) also made him a household name. As one HIP performer put it, “[...] communication was what David Munrow did best” “[...] David Munrow was a salesman – and a bloody good one too. He did an amazing job [...] but, you know, at what price?”^[6]

Far from selling out, the performers involved in HIP (e.g. Munrow, Hogwood, Norrington, Pinnock, Eliot Gardiner) negotiated authenticity with the record companies and the BBC in a way that allowed them to retain their artistic credibility whilst also garnering the financial support they needed to make the project happen. This relied on a particular type of performer-entrepreneur; someone who could “go between” (*entre-prendre*) without compromising their ideological principles.

6. The business of authenticity: a false relation?

The full story of the emergence of the HIP movement in the UK has yet to be told. In particular, there has been only marginal coverage of the seminal relationship between HIP performers and the authenticity business^[7]. In this paper I have drawn attention to the HIP performer (as opposed to the recording) as the “principal actual mediator” of early music. The socio-economically embedded “lived” practices and behaviours of those involved are central to any explanation of the early music movement. These practices were played out in the form of a struggle within structured space (see Bourdieu, 1993), as the HIP movement became increasingly institutionalised.

From a dialectical perspective we might want to ask what it was that was missing or absent (see Bhaskar, 1993), and so spurred the early music movement in happening when it did. The obvious answer is the opportunity to perform authentic performance at a professional level. The analysis here has indicated some of the activities and factors that may have contributed to this happening. However, there is perhaps an alternative explanation which sees the early music movement as providing a

previously absent freedom, or “play-space” for those involved to do something new and different. In short, performers, scholars (see Leech-Wilkinson, 2002), record company marketing departments, and even instrument makers^[8] could “make it up”. They could make it up because the vested interests of all key stakeholders allowed it. There are interesting parallels here with Santoro’s (2002) discussion of the Italian “cantautore”. As he notes “what was once a commercial classification was soon translated into a more complex label that transcended its origins and moved towards very different horizons” (p. 113).

Whilst bringing particular attention to the role of the recording market in “this successful labelling process and the web of meanings conveyed by it” (see Santoro (2002, pp. 115-16) for a similar discussion in the context of cantautori), I have also highlighted the role of a group of performer-entrepreneurs, whose ability to communicate and sell HIP to record company producers and senior executives, promoters, broadcasters, other performers and the listening public, was pivotal. What seems characteristic about these performer-entrepreneurs is that they were able to mediate between the three competing discourses^[9], which are used to value music – the bourgeois world of art-music; the folk music world; and the commercial music world or “majority culture” (Frith, 1996). As Frith (1996, p. 42) suggests “what is involved here is not the creation and maintenance of three distinct, autonomous music worlds but, rather, the play of three historically evolving discourses across a single field”. The distinctiveness of “authenticity” here provides a bridge or mediation (see Figure 2) between the world of art-music, i.e. classical music’s “particular notion of musical scholarship, [...] particular concept of musical talent, and [...] particular sort of musical event” (Frith, 1996, p. 39), and the commercial world’s *raison d’être* of turning sounds into commodities.

Not only did the (folk) discourse of authenticity give a confidence to the commercial side that what they were backing was valuable, but it also muted the accusations of “sell out” by HIP’s detractors within the mainstream. I think more research could usefully develop this line of thinking, particularly focusing on the distinctive and central role of the performer-entrepreneur in the process.

The paper provides evidence of a negotiated authenticity, where professional performers, producers, promoters, instrument-makers and others, were engaged, to a greater or lesser extent, in fabricating and manipulating the label “authenticity” as they lived out their varied beliefs and interests in HIP. In this context, the “fabrication of authenticity” was not a cynical attempt to make money. Rather, the pluralistic influences comprising the “movement”, constituted an emergent whole that was indeed greater than the sum of the parts – just as could be said of the emergent affective power of the false relation^[10]. Just as in the country music business (Peterson, 1997), authenticity was indeed negotiated – with the emergent result

Figure 2.



Authenticity as a mediating discourse

being more successful than either HIP performers or the authentic business had expected. From the unfolding story above it does seem fair to suggest that HIP performers and the authenticity business co-existed in a mutually beneficial relationship. There seems to be little evidence that the relationship was generally unhappy (though of course tensions existed). Their inter-dependence was not merely at the level of tolerating each other. Just as the affective power of the false relation comes through the proximity of the chromatic contradiction, I suggest that the success of the early music movement depended on (and emerged out of) the particularly close relationship between HIP performance and the market-driven authenticity business.

Before concluding, I should like to comment on one major absence from this account, namely the role played by the BBC. I have not discussed the seminal influence of the Third Programme (later Radio 3) and the group of early music producers (most of whom were scholars and performers in their own right), simply because of limited space in this article. Strictly speaking, we cannot separate their contribution from the story being told. Though much of the credit for the popularity of the early music movement is laid at the feet of the recording industry, it was the pioneering activities of those working in the publicly-funded BBC in the post-war years, and particularly in the 1960s and 1970s, as much as anyone else, that made this possible.

My inspiration for this paper has been the false relation. More than just a contradictory relationship that works, when it should not, the false relation possesses emergent properties, where the affect (and effect) of the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. In the case of the renaissance motet, the false relation's emergent power is to move us emotionally. In the case discussed here, it is precisely through the close relationship between HIP performers and the authenticity business that we can best explain the transformation of the early music movement from humble obscurity to the mainstream phenomenon it has become.

Notes

1. It is instructive, perhaps, that the "movement" is referred to in a number of different ways, betraying different emphases, which are lost in the general focus on claims for authenticity. At its heart, however, the early music movement has been concerned with performing music according to a more or less informed view of the original intentions of the composer.
2. In an interview with the author, Sir Roger Norrington used the term "robber-baron" to refer to himself and other music directors of HIP groups formed in the early 1970s. Whilst Potter's reference to "pirates" probably has a non-monetary "treasure" in mind, the reality of making money from early music lies not far under the surface.
3. Taruskin is "generally seen as early music's most ferocious detractor" (Sherman, 1997, p. 18), for his writings on the "tyrannically limiting" nature of much HIP.
4. Exploitation is not used here to imply anything more than "use" or "application".
5. Concentus Musicus Wien was founded by Nikolaus Harnoncourt in 1953, and is, for some, "largely responsible for launching the authentic instrument movement" (see www.bach-cantatas.com/Bio/Concentus-Musicus-Wien.htm, accessed 18 February 2011).
6. Munrow committed suicide in 1976. His influence on the development of the early music movement was enormous. The uncanny parallels with the cultural status and influence of Hank Williams in the country music business, and Luigi Tenco the

Italian “cantautore”, both of whom also died tragically and prematurely, are striking.

7. The story of the early music movement has particular lessons for policy makers, for example. The reliance of the HIP movement on the record companies challenges market failure arguments used to justify public subsidy of “high culture”.
8. Richard Wood (the founder of the Early Music Shop) tells how they invented and sold a completely fictitious early music instrument in the early years of the revival.
9. Frith (1996, p. 36) relates these three discourses to three sorts of art worlds (Becker, 1984), and three kinds of taste groups (Bourdieu, 2002).
10. The parable of the elephant and the blind men comes to mind. The “movement” is the elephant, but those feeling the trunk, the ears, or a back leg will have rather different perspectives on what the movement actually comprises.

References

- Adorno, T. W. (1967[1951]), “Bach defended against his devotees”, in Adorno, T.W. (Ed.), *Prisms*, Neville Spearman, London, pp. 133-46.
- Becker, H. (1984), *Art Worlds*, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Bhaskar, R. (1993), *Dialectic: The Pulse of Freedom*, Verso, London.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993), *The Field of Cultural Production*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Bourdieu, P. (2002), *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Routledge, London.
- Butt, J. (2002), *Playing with History*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Campbell, M. (1975), *Dolmetsch: The Man and His Work*, Hamish Hamilton, London.
- Crutchfield, W. (1988), “Fashion, conviction, and performance style in an age of revivals”, in Kenyon, N. (Ed.), *Authenticity and Early Music*, Chapter 2, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 19-26.
- DeNora, T. (2000), *Music in Everyday Life*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Donnington, R. (1975), “‘Foreword’ by Robert Donington”, in Campbell, M. (Ed.), *Dolmetsch: The Man and His Work*, Hamish Hamilton, London.
- Frey, B. and Pommerehne, W. (1989), *Muses and Markets*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Frith, S. (1996), *Performing Rites: On the Value of Popular Music*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Haynes, B. (2007), *The End of Early Music*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hennion, A. (1997), “Baroque and rock: music, mediators and musical taste”, *Poetics*, Vol. 24 No. 6, pp. 415-35.
- Hennion, A. and Fauquet, J. (2001), “Authority as performance: the love of Bach in nineteenth-century France”, *Poetics*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 75-88.
- Kenyon, N. (1988), *Authenticity and Early Music*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Leech-Wilkinson, D. (2002), *The Modern Invention of Medieval Music*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Mayer-Brown, H. (1988), “Pedantry or liberation? A sketch of the historical performance movement”, in Kenyon, N. (Ed.), *Authenticity and Early Music*, Chapter 2, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 27-56.
- Morgan, R. P. (1988), “Tradition, anxiety, and the current musical scene”, in Kenyon, N. (Ed.), *Authenticity and Early Music*, Chapter 3, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 57-82.
- Peterson, R. A. (1997), *Creating Country Music: Fabricating Authenticity*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

- Potter, J. (n.d.), "Early music", available at: www.john-potter.co.uk/blog/category/early-music/ (accessed 22 February 2011).
- Santoro, M. (2002), "What is a 'cantautore'?" Distinction and authorship in Italian (popular) music", *Poetics*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 111-32.
- Sherman, D. (1997), *Inside Early Music*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Taruskin, R. (1982), "The musicologist and the performer", in Holoman, D.K. and Palisca, C.V. (Eds), *Musicology in the 1980s Methods Goals, Opportunities*, Da Capo Press, New York, NY, pp. 101-17.
- Taruskin, R. (1988), "The pastness of the present and the presence of the past", in Kenyon, N. (Ed.), *Authenticity and Early Music*, Chapter 6, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 137-210.
- Taruskin, R. (1995), *Text & Act*, Oxford University Press, Oxford. Taruskin, R., Leech-Wilkinson, D., Temperley, N. and Winter, R. (1984), "The limits of authenticity: a discussion", *Early Music*, Vol. 12, pp. 3-25.